

REMARKS

In the Office Action, Claims 1 to 12 and 17 to 62 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over U.S. Patent No. 6,574,655 (Libert) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,415,282 (Mukherjea). The rejections are respectfully traversed and the Examiner is requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections in light of the following comments.

The present invention relates to providing the ability to access descriptions of multimedia items from a plurality of content providers. According to the invention, a server receives a request from a receiving process. The request is for descriptions or structured information, and is in a predetermined request format. The server interprets the received request, and accesses information in response to the interpreted request. The accessed information is then formatted as a description or structured information. The resulting description or structured information contains at least one link which represents a return request to the server. The return request represented by the link is in the predetermined request format and is for descriptions or structured information. Finally, the server then sends the formatted description or structured information to the receiving process. As a result, the return request is a further request that may be a sub-request of the original request.

As previously explained with reference to Examples H and I on pages 34 to 36, in response to a request for descriptions, the user is presented with 3 links. The first link is a request for images in a Lifestyle category, whereas the second and third links are requests to provide the sub-categories of Sports and Animals, respectively. In the event that the user selects the Sports link, a return request to the server is sent which results in 3 further links. The further links represent further return requests for providing images of the sub-categories Basketball, Football, and Hockey, respectively. Thus, the result of a request

to the server includes links in the same predetermined format as the original request representing further requests to that server.

With specific reference to the claims, independent Claim 1 is a system for facilitating access to descriptions of multimedia items from a plurality of content providers of the items, wherein information required by the descriptions is stored in corresponding metadata collections associated with the multimedia items, the system comprising (a) a metadata server associated with each the content provider and operable as a description-generating process for communicating with one or more description-receiving processes, each the metadata server being configured, for each the content provider, to perform the steps of (i) receiving a request for the descriptions from one of the description-receiving processes in a predetermined request format, (ii) interpreting the received request according to the predetermined request format, (iii) accessing the information about the multimedia items in the metadata collection of the content provider in response to the interpreted request, (iv) formatting the accessed information as a description according to a predetermined scheme, the resulting description containing at least one link which represents a return request in the predetermined request format to the metadata server for descriptions; and (v) sending the formatted description to the the description-receiving process, and (b) at least one the description-receiving process accessible to and operable by potential customers of the content providers and providing the potential customers with a single user interface to access descriptions of multimedia items generated from the multiple metadata servers.

Independent Claim 19 is a system for providing a plurality of users access to multimedia items associated with a plurality of content providers, each the content provider having a legacy database in which descriptions of corresponding items are stored, a content

database in which the corresponding multimedia items are stored, and a database manager for controlling access to the descriptions and corresponding multimedia items from the respective databases, the system comprising a media browser application accessible to each of the users and configured to generate user requests for descriptions of the multimedia items, the requests being generated in a predetermined request format, and a metadata server application associated with each the content provider and configured to translate each the user request received by the metadata server application from the predetermined request format into a specific format of the database manager to thereby provide for the database manager to query the legacy database and return at least one response description to the metadata server application, the metadata server application translating the at least one response description into a predetermined description format and returning the translated description to the requesting media browser application for presentation to the user, the translated description including at least one link which represents a return request for description to the metadata server application.

Independent Claim 25 is a system for facilitating access to structured information from a plurality of heterogeneous information sources, the system comprising (a) an information server associated with each the information source and operable as a structured information generating process for communicating with one or more structured information receiving processes, each information server being configured to perform, for an information source, the steps of (i) receiving a request for the structured information from one of the structured information receiving processes in a predetermined request format, (ii) interpreting the received request according to the predetermined request format, (iii) accessing information in the associated information source in response to the interpreted request, (iv) formatting the accessed information as the structured information

according to a predetermined scheme, the resulting structured information containing at least one link which represents a return request in the predetermined request format to the information server for structured information; and (v) sending the structured information to the structured information receiving process, and (b) at least one structured information receiving process accessible to and operable by potential users of the information sources with a single user interface to access and interpret the structured information from the multiple information servers.

Independent Claim 37 is a metadata server operable as a description-generating process for communicating with one or more description-receiving processes, the metadata server being configured to perform the steps of (i) receiving a request for descriptions of multimedia items from one of the description-receiving processes in a predetermined request format, wherein information required by the descriptions is stored in corresponding metadata collections associated with the multimedia items, (ii) interpreting the received request according to the predetermined request format, (iii) accessing the information about the multimedia items in the metadata collection of the content provider in response to the interpreted request, (iv) formatting the accessed information as a description according to a predetermined scheme, the resulting description containing at least one link which represents a return request in the predetermined request format to the metadata server for descriptions of multimedia items, and (v) sending the formatted description to the description-receiving process.

Independent Claim 49 is an information server operable as a structured information generating process for communicating with one or more structured information receiving processes, the information server being configured to perform the steps of (i) receiving a request for structured information from one of the structured information

receiving processes in a predetermined request format, (ii) interpreting the received request according to the predetermined request format, (iii) accessing information in an information source in response to the interpreted request, (iv) formatting the accessed information as the structured information according to a predetermined scheme, the resulting structured information containing at least one link which represents a return request in the predetermined request format to the information server for structured information, and (v) sending the structured information to the structured information receiving process.

Independent Claims 61 and 62 are computer readable medium claims that substantially correspond to Claim 37 and 49, respectively.

The applied art, alone or in any permissible combination, is not seen to disclose or to suggest the features of Claims 1, 19, 25, 37, 49, 61 and 62. In particular, the applied art is not seen to disclose or to suggest at least the feature of a server interpreting a received request for a description or structured information in a predetermined format, and accessing information in response to the interpreted request, where the accessed information is formatted as a description or structured information, the resulting description or structured information containing at least one link which represents a return request to the server in the predetermined request format.

The Office Action more or less admits that Libert is not seen to disclose the foregoing features. Moreover, as understood by Applicants, Libert is merely seen to disclose a system for associatively managing distributed multimedia assets, where the system includes user agents 30 that represents end-user applications 31, and Resource Brokers 32 that represent resource servers 33. The resource servers store assets, each identified by globally unique Universal Resource Name (URN) or a Universal Resource

Locator (URL). In one implementation, described in column 11, lines 57 to 59, the "Resource Brokers may be designed to support searching on metadata via a centralized Search Engine that caches some or all of the Broker's metadata." In this case, the Search Engine needs to be updated whenever searchable metadata is created or changed. In another implementation, the Resource Broker is a wrapper around an existing database that provides all required search services. Thus, Libert is merely seen to disclose that the Resource Broker accepts a query from a search client, processes the query, and returns results. However, Libert is not seen to disclose or to suggest at least the feature of a server interpreting a received request for a description or structured information in a predetermined format, and accessing information in response to the interpreted request, where the accessed information is formatted as a description or structured information, the resulting description or structured information containing at least one link which represents a return request to the server in the predetermined request format.

Nonetheless, the Office Action takes the position that Mukherjea allegedly discloses the features missing from Libert. However, Applicants respectfully disagree with the Office Action's assessment of Mukherjea's disclosure.


In this regard, the Office Action cites to figs. 3-7, and lines 11-20 of column 1, lines 35-45 of column 3, lines 18-65 of column 5, and line 61 of column 6 through line 23 of column 7, as allegedly disclosing the claimed resulting description containing at least one link which represents a return request in the same predetermined format as the original request. However, Applicants no disclosure or suggestion in the foregoing passages of a link within returned query results representing a return request in the same predetermined format as the original request. In fact, Applicants fail to see any disclosure in Mukherjea of any specific request format, and of how a query is submitted that is limited to a cluster,

where the cluster is within an original search result set or a partition of some other larger set of resources. In Mukherjea, all search results are first retrieved and then clustered before presentation to the user. The user may select any one of the presented clusters in order to view the actual retrieved results. However, there is no disclosure that the selection of a cluster results in a new request. (See for example, col. 5, lines 4-17 and col. 7, lines 5 to 23). Accordingly, Applicants fail to see how the proposed combination of Libert and Mukherjea would have resulted in the present invention.

In view of the foregoing deficiencies of the applied art, the entire application is believed to be in condition for allowance and such action is respectfully requested at the Examiner's earliest convenience.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our Costa Mesa, California office at (714) 540-8700. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below-listed address.

Respectfully submitted,



Attorney for Applicants
Edward A. Kmett
Registration No.: 42,746

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-2200
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

CA_MAIN 98525v1